

REMARKS

A. Status of Claims.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1-17 are pending. In this Amendment, Claims 2, 4, 7 and 12 have been amended to clarify the subject matter encompassed by these claims. No new matter is added.

B. Amendments to Specification.

The above amendments to the specification correct typographical errors in the specification. Support for the amendments to Paragraph [124] is found in FIG. 7D, as well as elsewhere in the originally filed specification, drawings and claims.

C. Examiner Interview.

The Applicants wish to thank Examiner Wong for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative in a January 25, 2005 telephone interview (Examiner Interview) during which the outstanding rejections were discussed. As agreed during the Examiner Interview, the Togami and Corbin references do not teach or suggest a "handle including first and second cams" on respective first and second arms of the handle as claimed by Claims 1-6. As also agreed during the Examiner Interview, the Togami and Corbin references do not teach or suggest a cam that "is pivoted to cause a free end of [a] rocker return spring to be lifted and thereby cause: a free end of [a] cage flange spring to be lifted and [a] tab to be unrestrained in a proximal direction by [a] rocker return spring opening and [a] cage flange spring opening, to thereby allow said transceiver body to be removed from said cage" as claimed by Claims 7-17. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is contained in the comments above as well as in the discussion below.

D. Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating in Section 1 of the Office Action that the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on February 20, 2004 is in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.97 and has been considered by the Examiner.

E. Response to Claim Objections.

The objections to Claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph have been obviated by the above amendments to Claims 2 and 4.

F. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as Being Anticipated by Togami.

At Sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,439,918 to Togami *et al.* (Togami). This rejection has been rendered moot.

As agreed during the Examiner Interview, Togami does not teach or suggest a “handle including first and second cams” on respective first and second arms of the handle as claimed by Claims 1-4 and 6. As also agreed during the Examiner Interview, Togami does not teach or suggest a cam that “is pivoted to cause of a free end of [a] rocker return spring to be lifted and thereby cause a free end of [a] cage flange spring [of a cage] to be lifted” to “thereby cause a free end of said cage flange spring to be lifted, [a] tab [on a transceiver body] to be unrestrained in a proximal direction by said rocker return spring opening and said cage flange spring opening, and said transceiver body to be removed from said cage” as claimed by Claims 7-8, 10-13 and 15-17.

Therefore, Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13 and 15-17 are patentable over Togami, and the rejection of these claims over Togami should be withdrawn.

G. Response to Rejection of Claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as Being Anticipated by Corbin.

At Section 5 of the Office Action, Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,229,708 to Corbin, Jr. *et al.* (Corbin). This rejection has been rendered moot.

As agreed during the Examiner Interview, Corbin does not teach or suggest a “handle including first and second cams” on respective first and second arms of the handle as claimed by Claims 1 and 5. Therefore, Claims 1 and 5 are patentable over Togami, and the rejection of these claims over Togami should be withdrawn.

H. Response to Rejection of Claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable over Togami.

At Sections 6 and 7 of the Office Action, Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Togami. This rejection has been rendered moot.

As also agreed during the Examiner Interview, Togami does not teach or suggest a cam that “is pivoted to cause a free end of [a] rocker return spring to be lifted and thereby cause: a free end of [a] cage flange spring to be lifted and [a] tab to be unrestrained in a proximal direction by [a] rocker return spring opening and [a] cage flange spring opening, to thereby allow said transceiver body to be removed from said cage” as claimed by Claims 9 and 14.


Therefore, Claims 9 and 14 are patentable over Togami, and the rejection of these claims over Togami should be withdrawn.

H. Conclusion.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding the present response, the Examiner is invited to contact Mark J. Guttag at 703-591-2664, Ext. 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Guttag
Reg. No. 33,057

JAGTIANI + GUTTAG
Democracy Square Business Center
10363-A Democracy Lane
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703-591-2664

February 2, 2006